# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10/821,195 | 04/09/2004 | Yih Huang | GMU-03-023U | 8608 |

28598          7590          05/31/2007
GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY
OFFICE OF TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER, MSN 5G5
4400 UNIVERSITY DRIVE
FAIRFAX, VA 22030

| EXAMINER |
|---|
| GELAGAY, SHEWAYE |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2137 | |

| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|---|---|
| 05/31/2007 | PAPER |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|---|---|---|
| | 10/821,195 | HUANG ET AL. |
| | **Examiner** | **Art Unit** | |
| | Shewaye Gelagay | 2137 | |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _09 April 2004_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL.**    2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-27_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-27_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

1.      Claims 1-27 have been examined.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

2.      The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by
> another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent
> granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the
> applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section
> 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States
> only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2)
> of such treaty in the English language.

3.      Claims 1-10, 12-24 and 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being

anticipated by Bommareddy et al. (hereinafter Bommareddy) US Patent Number

6,880,089.

As per claims 1 and 16:

        Bommareddy a self-cleansing system comprising:

        a) at least two subsystems, said at least two subsystems including an active

subsystem and at least one available inactive subsystem; (col. 15, lines 66-67)

        b) a communications link connecting said at least two subsystems; (figure 8)

c) a local network capable of connecting said at least two subsystems to an external network; (figure 8)

d) an arbitration mechanism capable of designating one of said at least one available inactive subsystem to be a designated active system; (figure 8)

e) an IP address shared by at least said active subsystem and said designated active subsystem, only said active subsystem utilizing said IP address to output information to said external network; (col. 16, lines 4-13)

f) a transfer mechanism capable of:

   i) deactivating said active subsystem, causing said active subsystem to become a deactivated subsystem; (col. 19, line 38-col. 22, line 39) and

   ii) activating said designated active subsystem, causing said designated active subsystem to become said active subsystem; (col. 19, line 38-col. 22, line 39) and

g) a self-cleansing mechanism capable of cleansing said deactivated subsystem, causing said deactivated subsystem to become one of said at least one available inactive subsystem. (col. 19, line 38-col. 22, line 39)

As per claims 2 and 17:

Bommareddy further teaches a system wherein said arbitration mechanism uses a criterion to select which of said at least one available inactive subsystem is to be designated said designated active subsystem. (col. 19, line 38-col. 22, line 39)

As per claim 3:

Bommareddy further teaches a system wherein said transfer mechanism is activated by a transfer criterion. (col. 19, line 38-col. 22, line 39)

As per claim 4 and 18:

Bommareddy further teaches a system wherein said transfer criterion is a fault detection criterion. (col. 19, line 38-col. 22, line 39)

As per claims 5 and 19:

Bommareddy further teaches a system wherein said transfer criterion is an intrusion detection criterion. (col. 3, lines 35-37; col. 8, lines 52-60; col. 19, line 38-col. 22, line 39; col. 23, lines 61-67)

As per claim 6 and 20:

Bommareddy further teaches a system wherein said transfer criterion considers time. (col. 19, lines 1-4)

As per claim 7 and 21:

Bommareddy further teaches a system wherein at least two of said at least two subsystems are firewalls. (figure 1)

As per claim 8 and 22:

Bommareddy further teaches a system wherein at least two of said at least two subsystems are servers. (col. 3, lines 26-30)

As per claim 9 and 23:

Bommareddy further teaches a system wherein at least two of said at least two subsystems are gateways. (col. 4, lines 23-30)

As per claim 10 and 24:

Bommareddy further teaches a system further include integrity check capability. (col. 3, lines 35-37; col. 8, lines 52-60; col. 19, line 38-col. 22, line 39; col. 23, lines 61-67)

As per claim 12 and 26:

Bommareddy further teaches a system wherein said self-cleansing mechanism includes a capability to reboot at least one of said at least two subsystems. (col. 19, line 38-col. 22, line 39)

As per claim 13:

Bommareddy further teaches a system further including shared storage accessible by at least two of said at least two subsystems. (col. 6, lines 36-41)

As per claim 14:

Bommareddy further teaches a system wherein said communications link is part of said local network. (figure 1)

As per claim 15 and 27:

Bommareddy further teaches a system wherein said active subsystem is a plurality of active subsystems. (col. 15, lines 66-67)

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.    The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.      Claims 11 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Bommareddy et al. (hereinafter Bommareddy) US Patent Number 6,880,089 in

view of Goseva-Popstojanova et al. (hereinafter Goseva) US Publication Number

2003/0033542.

As per claims 11 and 25:

Bommareddy does not explicitly disclose a system including step of auditing said

system cleansing actions. Goseva in analogous art, however, discloses a system

including step of auditing said system cleansing actions. (page 3, paragraphs 29-31)

Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art to modify the

method disclosed by Bommareddy with Goseva in order to have a system that provides

an independent examination of records and events to ensure compliance with

established procedures. (page 3, paragraph 29; Goseva)

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Shewaye Gelagay whose telephone number is 571-272-

4219.  The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on 571-272-3865.  The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


Shewaye Gelagay


EMMANUEL L. MOISE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER